REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed **5 December 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 49-66. Claims 49-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 49-50, 54-56, 60-62, and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over D. Richard Kuhn (USPN 6,023,765, hereinafter "Kuhn") in view of Sweet et al (USPub 2002/0031230, hereinafter "Sweet"). Claims 51-53, 57-59, and 63-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuhn, in view of Sweet, and further in view of Minear et al. (USPN 5,983,350 hereinafter "Minear").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 49, 55, and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicant has amended independent claims 49, 55, and 61 to overcome this rejection. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 49, 55, and 61 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kuhn, in view of Sweet. Applicant respectfully points out that the present invention is directed to a special administrator (i.e., a security officer) that is the only administrator that can perform administrative functions on **sensitive users** (see page 7, lines 9-11; page 8, lines 11-13; page 8, lines 19-20; and page 9, line 19 to page 10, line 6 of the instant application).

Examiner avers that Kuhn and Sweet disclose restricting administrative functions from being performed on sensitive users (see pages 4-6 of Office Action letter dated 12/05/2006). However, Applicant points out that the Kuhn only discloses restricting **access to sensitive objects** (and not to sensitive users) (see Kuhn, column 2, lines 9-13; column 2, lines 29-35; column 3, lines 36-38; column 4, lines 53-56; column 6, lines 49-52; and column 7, lines 18-24). Similarly, Sweet

8

only discloses restricting **access to sensitive objects** (see Sweet, paragraph [0081] – encrypted data object).

Objects and users are not the same. Restricting access to sensitive objects so that only sensitive users can access sensitive objects is not sufficient. For example, if a rogue database administrator can perform administrative functions on the sensitive user (e.g., changing a password), the rogue administrator can then log in using the sensitive user's username and newly-modified password to gain access to the sensitive object.

There is nothing in Kuhn or Sweet, either separately or in concert, which suggests a special administrator that is the only administrator that can perform administrative functions on **sensitive users**.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 49, 55, and 61 as presented are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 50-54, which depend upon claim 49, claims 56-60, which depend upon claim 55, and claims 62-66, which depend upon claim 61 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 13 February 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com